



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/700,017	11/03/2003	Lawrence W. McVoy	BIT 64308	3711

7590 11/17/2006

Robert P. Lenart
Pietragallo, Bosick & Gordon
One Oxford Centre, 38th Floor
301 Grant Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

EXAMINER

CHEN, QING

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2191

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/700,017

Applicant(s)

MCVOY ET AL.

Examiner

Qing Chen

Art Unit

2191

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 November 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20031103</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is the initial Office action based on the application filed on November 3, 2003.
2. **Claims 1-21** are pending.

Oath/Declaration

3. The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:

It does not state that the person making the oath or declaration believes the named inventor or inventors to be the joint inventors of the subject matter which is claimed and for which a patent is sought.

Drawings

4. The drawings are objected to because Figure 8 doesn't clearly show the shading of the drawing elements as indicated in the specification. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application.

Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets

Art Unit: 2191

may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the Examiner, the Applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

5. **Claims 4, 7, 8, and 14** are objected to because of the following informalities:
- **Claims 4 and 8** contain a typographical error: a colon (:) should be added after the phrase "step of" and the claim limitation should subsequently start on a new line.
 - **Claim 7** recites the limitation "the version control metadata." The Examiner subsequently interprets this limitation as reading "the version control system metadata" for the purpose of providing it with proper explicit antecedent basis.
 - **Claim 8** depends on Claim 7 and, therefore, suffers the same deficiency as Claim 7.
 - **Claim 14** contains a typographical error: "steps" should be changed to singular form, since the method claim is further limited by only one step.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. **Claims 7, 8, and 16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 7 recites the limitation “the stacked diffs.” There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. In the interest of compact prosecution, the Examiner subsequently interprets this limitation as reading “the first and second sets of stacked diffs” for the purpose of further examination.

Claim 7 recites the limitation “the active portion.” There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. In the interest of compact prosecution, the Examiner subsequently interprets this limitation as reading “the active conflict” for the purpose of further examination.

Claim 8 depends on Claim 7 and, therefore, suffers the same deficiencies as Claim 7.

Claim 16 recites the limitation “the active change.” There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. In the interest of compact prosecution, the Examiner subsequently interprets this limitation as reading “an active conflict” for the purpose of further examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

8. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

9. **Claims 15-19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 15-19 contain “means-plus-function” limitations. However, it is noted that the specification does not disclose any specific corresponding structure or equivalents thereof. Therefore, these claim limitations can reasonably be interpreted as computer program modules—software *per se*. The claims are directed to apparatus of functional descriptive material *per se*, and hence non-statutory. The claims constitute computer programs representing computer listings *per se*. Such descriptions or expressions of the programs are not physical “things.” They are neither computer components nor statutory processes, as they are not “acts” being performed. Such claimed computer programs do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and other claimed elements of a computer, which permit the computer program’s functionality to be realized. In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program is a computer element, which defines structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and the rest of the computer, that permits the computer program’s functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory. See *Lowry*, 32 F.3d at 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d at 1035.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

11. **Claims 1, 3-9, 13-16, and 18-20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Fontes, Jr.** (US 6,912,707).

As per **Claim 1**, **Fontes, Jr.** discloses:

- producing a first set of stacked diffs between the first computer file and the common computer file (*see Figure 6; Column 4: 42-50, "... architect is creating revised base drawing 602."; Column 9: 7, "These 'changes only' files are called 'Diff Files.'"*);
- producing a second set of stacked diffs between the second computer file and the common computer file (*see Figure 6; Column 4: 42-50, "Architect 200 creates base drawing 300 and sends base drawing 300 to engineer 204 via path 202. While engineer 204 is creating revision 600 ..."; Column 9: 7, "These 'changes only' files are called 'Diff Files.'"*); and
- simultaneously displaying the first and second sets of stacked diffs, wherein common lines of the first and second sets of stacked diffs are aligned and new lines of each of the first and second sets of stacked diffs are aligned with blank lines of the other stacked diff (*see Figures 10*

Art Unit: 2191

and 12; Column 6: 40-48, "... the user can define which file is considered the revision 302 and which file is considered the revised base 500, such that the user-defined revision file 302 appears on the left and the user-defined revised base 500 file appears on the right."; Column 7: 1-5, "Window 1200 contains windows 1202 and 1204, which display the layer information for base drawing 300 and revision 302. Window 1200 can also be used with the merge and parallel evolution mode of the present invention. If a layer is missing from either base drawing 300 or revision 302, the layer appears as a blank line in the other drawing file's window 1202 or 1204.").

As per **Claim 3**, the rejection of **Claim 1** is incorporated; and Fontes, Jr. further discloses:

- wherein conflicts between the first and second computer files are displayed and only one conflict is active at a time (*see Column 6: 26-30, "Window 1002 displays revision 302, and window 1004 displays revised base 500. In window 1002, line 1006 is shown as a dashed line, and in window 904, line 1008 is shown as a solid line. This indicates to the user that line 1006 and line 1008 are different between the two drawings."*).

As per **Claim 4**, the rejection of **Claim 3** is incorporated; and Fontes, Jr. further discloses:

- displaying version control system metadata relating to the active conflict (*see Column 9: 38-41, "Prior to applying the diff file, the comparator compares the identification values of the base drawing 300 and the diff file, and warns the user if the values don't match."*).

As per **Claim 5**, the rejection of **Claim 4** is incorporated; and Fontes, Jr. further discloses:

- wherein version control system metadata may insert a revision number, date, checkin comments, and/or user identification pertaining to the version in which data was created (*see Column 9: 13-17 and 35-38, "A diff file must contain enough information to add ... data." and "To ensure that the correct base drawing 300 is undergoing the comparison by comparator 120, the diff file contains a identification that is compared to the base drawing 300."*).

As per **Claim 6**, the rejection of **Claim 4** is incorporated; and Fontes, Jr. further discloses:

- wherein version control system metadata may insert a revision number, date, checkin comments, and/or user identification pertaining to the version in which data was deleted (*see Column 9: 13-17 and 35-38, "A diff file must contain enough information to ... delete data." and "To ensure that the correct base drawing 300 is undergoing the comparison by comparator 120, the diff file contains a identification that is compared to the base drawing 300."*).

As per **Claim 7**, the rejection of **Claim 4** is incorporated; and Fontes, Jr. further discloses:

- searching an active conflict of the first and second sets of stacked diffs (*see Column 9: 13-17, "A diff file must contain enough information to add, modify, and delete data ... This data is stored as a series of operations. When the user applies a diff file as a revision 302,*

Art Unit: 2191

comparator 120 iterates through the database operations and applies each one to the base drawing 300.");

- creating a list of revisions for lines deleted from the active conflict (*see Column 9: 18-22, "Viewing the diff file as a collection of records, a typical record for entity data would have an operation that is performed on the entity, e.g., update, delete, or insert; data needed if the operation is an update or insertion, and the handle of the entity, if it is an update or deletion."*);

- creating a list of revisions for lines added from the active conflict (*see Column 9: 18-22, "Viewing the diff file as a collection of records, a typical record for entity data would have an operation that is performed on the entity, e.g., update, delete, or insert; data needed if the operation is an update or insertion, and the handle of the entity, if it is an update or deletion."*);

and

- displaying the version control system metadata relating to the deleted lines and/or the added lines (*see Column 9: 38-41, "Prior to applying the diff file, the comparator compares the identification values of the base drawing 300 and the diff file, and warns the user if the values don't match."*).

As per **Claim 8**, the rejection of **Claim 7** is incorporated; and Fontes, Jr. further discloses:

- displaying creation information or deletion information for deleted lines (*see Column 6: 32-34, "Thus, the comparator considers revision 302 to be correct, and displays changes to revision 302 instead of revised base 500."*).

As per **Claim 9**, the rejection of **Claim 3** is incorporated; and Fontes, Jr. further discloses:

- alternatively displaying or not displaying deleted lines in the active conflict in the first and second set of stacked diffs (*see Column 5: 54-59, "Other indications of differences between base drawing 300 and revision 302 are possible with the present invention, e.g., lines can be displayed in different colors, can 'blink' on and off to show differences, or any other manner of indicating to the user that something has changed between the two drawings."*).

As per **Claim 13**, the rejection of **Claim 1** is incorporated; and Fontes, Jr. further discloses:

- alternatively displaying or not displaying deleted lines in the first and second sets of stacked diffs (*see Column 5: 54-59, "Other indications of differences between base drawing 300 and revision 302 are possible with the present invention, e.g., lines can be displayed in different colors, can 'blink' on and off to show differences, or any other manner of indicating to the user that something has changed between the two drawings."*).

As per **Claim 14**, the rejection of **Claim 1** is incorporated; and Fontes, Jr. further discloses:

- alternatively displaying or not displaying annotations with the first and second sets of stacked diffs (*see Figures 16A and 16B; Column 7: 56-63, "FIGS. 16A and 16B illustrate summaries of the comparison presented by the present invention. FIG. 16A illustrates the*

Art Unit: 2191

comparator 120 of the present invention outputting on window 1600 a list of all files compared in the comparison described in FIG. 15. The summary is shown in result order in FIG. 16A, and file alphabetical order in FIG. 16B.”).

As per **Claim 15**, Fontes, Jr. discloses:

- means for producing a first set of stacked diffs between the first computer file and the common computer file and for producing a second set of stacked diffs between the second computer file and the common computer file (*see Figure 6; Column 4: 42-50, “Architect 200 creates base drawing 300 and sends base drawing 300 to engineer 204 via path 202. While engineer 204 is creating revision 600, architect is creating revised base drawing 602.”; Column 9: 7, “These ‘changes only’ files are called ‘Diff Files.’”*); and
- means for simultaneously displaying the first and second sets of stacked diffs, wherein common lines of the first and second sets of stacked diffs are aligned and new lines of each of the first and second sets of stacked diffs are aligned with blank lines of the other stacked diff (*see Figures 10 and 12; Column 6: 40-48, “... the user can define which file is considered the revision 302 and which file is considered the revised base 500, such that the user-defined revision file 302 appears on the left and the user-defined revised base 500 file appears on the right.”; Column 7: 1-5, “Window 1200 contains windows 1202 and 1204, which display the layer information for base drawing 300 and revision 302. Window 1200 can also be used with the merge and parallel evolution mode of the present invention. If a layer is missing from either base drawing 300 or revision 302, the layer appears as a blank line in the other drawing file's window 1202 or 1204.”*).

As per **Claim 16**, the rejection of **Claim 15** is incorporated; and Fontes, Jr. further discloses:

- wherein the means for simultaneously displaying the first and second sets of stacked diffs displays version control metadata relating to an active conflict (*see Column 9: 38-41, "Prior to applying the diff file, the comparator compares the identification values of the base drawing 300 and the diff file, and warns the user if the values don't match."*).

As per **Claim 18**, the rejection of **Claim 15** is incorporated; and Fontes, Jr. further discloses:

- means for displaying annotations in the first and second sets of stacked diffs (*see Figures 16A and 16B; Column 7: 56-63, "FIGS. 16A and 16B illustrate summaries of the comparison presented by the present invention. FIG. 16A illustrates the comparator 120 of the present invention outputting on window 1600 a list of all files compared in the comparison described in FIG. 15. The summary is shown in result order in FIG. 16A, and file alphabetical order in FIG. 16B."*).

As per **Claim 19**, the rejection of **Claim 15** is incorporated; and Fontes, Jr. further discloses:

- means for alternatively displaying or not displaying deleted lines in the first and second sets of stacked diffs (*see Column 5: 54-59, "Other indications of differences between base drawing 300 and revision 302 are possible with the present invention, e.g., lines can be*

Art Unit: 2191

displayed in different colors, can 'blink' on and off to show differences, or any other manner of indicating to the user that something has changed between the two drawings."').

Claim 20 is a computer readable medium claim corresponding to the apparatus claim above (Claim 15) and, therefore, is rejected for the same reason set forth in the rejection of Claim 15.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. **Claim 2** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Fontes, Jr.** (US 6,912,707) in view of **Hughes** (US 6,275,223).

As per **Claim 2**, the rejection of **Claim 1** is incorporated; however, **Fontes, Jr.** does not disclose:

- wherein the first and second sets of stacked diffs can be scrolled together.

Hughes discloses wherein the first and second sets of stacked diffs can be scrolled together (*see Column 12: 43-56, "The original source code and new source code can be scrolled up and down together by activation of vertical scroll bar 1505. Respective first and second*

Art Unit: 2191

source code windows each have a corresponding respective horizontal scroll bar 1506, 1513 for enabling horizontal scrolling of code items within the source code windows."

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Hughes into the teaching of Fontes, Jr. to include wherein the first and second sets of stacked diffs can be scrolled together. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to improve usability in visual comparison of the software files.

14. **Claims 10, 12, 17, and 21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fontes, Jr. (US 6,912,707) in view of Percival et al. (US 6,226,652).

As per **Claim 10**, the rejection of **Claim 1** is incorporated; however, Fontes, Jr. does not disclose:

- selecting one line or block of lines from either of the first and second sets of stacked diffs;
- copying the selected lines to a conflict resolution pane; and
- repeating the selecting and copying steps to achieve a conflict resolution.

Percival et al. disclose:

- selecting one line or block of lines from either of the first and second sets of stacked diffs (*see Column 4: 9-11, "To merge the files, User A must mark blocks or lines of code to be excluded from the target (i.e., the file which will be checked into the database) ..."*);

- copying the selected lines to a conflict resolution pane (*see Column 4: 11-12, "... then saves and checks in the resulting file."*); and
- repeating the selecting and copying steps to achieve a conflict resolution (*see Column 4: 12-17, "To deal with the second collision, User A must start all over again, once again navigating the menubar ..., selecting another collision record from the list, etc. This process must be repeated for each of the detected collisions, i.e., for each file pair with differences."*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Percival et al. into the teaching of Fontes, Jr. to include selecting one line or block of lines from either of the first and second sets of stacked diffs; copying the selected lines to a conflict resolution pane; and repeating the selecting and copying steps to achieve a conflict resolution. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to allow a user to merge one set of changed files at a time (*see Percival et al. – Column 1: 22-25*).

As per **Claim 12**, the rejection of **Claim 10** is incorporated; and Fontes, Jr. further discloses:

- moving to a successive or previous conflict (*see Column 6: 4-8, "If the user wants the final drawing to look like the revision 302, the user can select the next button 914 to go to the next change. If the user goes past a change and wants to review it again, the user can review previous changes by selecting button 912 ..."*).

As per **Claim 17**, the rejection of **Claim 15** is incorporated; however, Fontes, Jr. does not disclose:

- means for selecting one or more lines from each of the first and second sets of stacked diffs and for copying the selected lines to a conflict resolution pane.

Percival et al. disclose:

- means for selecting one or more lines from each of the first and second sets of stacked diffs and for copying the selected lines to a conflict resolution pane (*see Column 4: 9-12, "To merge the files, User A must mark blocks or lines of code to be excluded from the target (i.e., the file which will be checked into the database), and then saves and checks in the resulting file."*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Percival et al. into the teaching of Fontes, Jr. to include means for selecting one or more lines from each of the first and second sets of stacked diffs and for copying the selected lines to a conflict resolution pane. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to allow a user to merge one set of changed files at a time (*see Percival et al. – Column 1: 22-25*).

As per **Claim 21**, the rejection of **Claim 20** is incorporated; however, Fontes, Jr. does not disclose:

- computer readable means for selecting one or more lines or one or more blocks of lines from each of the first and second sets of stacked diffs and for copying the selected lines to a conflict resolution pane.

Percival et al. disclose:

Art Unit: 2191

- computer readable means for selecting one or more lines or one or more blocks of lines from each of the first and second sets of stacked diffs and for copying the selected lines to a conflict resolution pane (*see Column 4: 9-12, "To merge the files, User A must mark blocks or lines of code to be excluded from the target (i.e., the file which will be checked into the database), and then saves and checks in the resulting file."*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Percival et al. into the teaching of Fontes, Jr. to include computer readable means for selecting one or more lines or one or more blocks of lines from each of the first and second sets of stacked diffs and for copying the selected lines to a conflict resolution pane. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to allow a user to merge one set of changed files at a time (*see Percival et al. – Column 1: 22-25*).

15. **Claim 11** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fontes, Jr. (US 6,912,707) in view of Percival et al. (US 6,226,652) as applied to Claim 10 above, and further in view of Budinsky et al. (US 6,407,753).

As per **Claim 11**, the rejection of **Claim 10** is incorporated; however, Fontes, Jr. and Percival et al. do not disclose:

- undoing the selection and copying steps.

Budinsky et al. disclose undoing the selection and copying steps (*see Column 9: 35-38*,

"A determination is then made as to whether the selected rule is disabled (step 603), for

example, by either an 'Undo' operation manually selected by the user, or manually disabled by the user upon viewing the rule set. ").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Budinsky et al. into the teaching of Fontes, Jr. to include undoing the selection and copying steps. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to revert selected data back to its original state.

Conclusion

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

A. **Skinner** (US 5,481,722) discloses steps and means employed for merging two change control delta structure files of a source module from a parent and a child development environment.

B. **Squibb** (US 5,729,743) discloses a system filter for merging a number of system deltas with a primary input stream (comprising system data), in a single pass, to build a primary output stream (comprising revised system data).

C. **Squibb** (US 5,745,906) discloses a computer apparatus and method for merging a sequential plurality of delta streams, wherein each delta stream represents a change to either a prior delta stream, an original data stream, or an updated data stream.

D. **Veghte et al.** (US 5,845,293) disclose an improved system for, and method of, associating, synchronizing and reconciling computer files in an operating system.

E. **Balcha et al.** (US 6,233,589) disclose a method and system for reflecting differences between two files.

F. **Bolosky et al.** (US 6,389,433) disclose a method and system that operates as a background process automatically identify and merge duplicate files into a single instance files, wherein the duplicate files become independent links to the single instance files.

G. **Cohen et al.** (US 7,017,144) disclose a system and method for collapsing multiple individual images into a single combined image from which each of the individual images may be re-created.

H. **Barsness et al.** (US 7,086,046) disclose a method and apparatus for displaying compiler-optimized code.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Qing Chen whose telephone number is 571-270-1071. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM. The Examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Wei Zhen, can be reached on 571-272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

Art Unit: 2191

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

QC / QC
October 31, 2006


WEI ZHEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER